DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 273 EA 022 154

AUTHOR Beare, Hedley
TITLE Educational Administration in the 1990's. ACEA Monograph Series No. 6.
INSTITUTION Australian Council for Educational Administration, Inc., Hawthorn, Victoria (Australia).
REPORT NO ISSN-0813-5355
PUB DATE Sep 89
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Council for Educational Administration (Armidale, New South Wales, Australia, September 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Economic Factors; *Educational Administration; *Efficiency; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Free Enterprise System; Government Role; *Organizational Change; Privatization; Professional Associations; Quality of Working Life; *School Restructuring; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; Professionalism

ABSTRACT

By 1990 Australia had experienced almost 10 years of incessant activity to restructure education. In many respects, educators are not in control of the change process. This paper explains transformations that have occurred in the senior education positions, in the shape of educational organizations (including schools), and in the way education is being conceived of and described. Concerning educators and managers, the education profession is no longer a definable club, but has become a more diffuse, complicated, and political arena. Senior educators are termed "chief executives" and are usually highly mobile, middle-aged males who have economics degrees, but may not be professional educators. Newly emerging school organizations are characterized by simple, politically controlled, and efficient management; portfolio and policy coordination; lean head office management; decentralized responsibility; and reliance on national government policies and priorities. The postbureaucratic organization banishes certain assumptions regarding specialization, hierarchy, and status, and substitutes the constellation or network model. Somehow, "educational administration" has been transformed into "efficient management." Speculations are provided concerning possible future developments, such as self-governing (privatized) schools, professional services, school administrators' roles, teacher career patterns, and career planning. (44 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332273

ISSN 0813-5355

ACEA
MONOGRAPH
SERIES

6

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION IN THE 1990's

Hedley Beare

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Beare

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EA 022 154

Educational Administration in the 1990s

Hedley Beare
Professor of Education
Head, School of Education
University of Melbourne

A paper presented on 25 September 1989 at the national conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration, held in the University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales.

I
Ourselves in Historical Sequence

We may well be standing today at one of those important road junctions in history where we need to read the road map and ask ourselves what direction we expect to travel in. A number of recent books, like Willis Harman's Global Mind Change (1988), have suggested that fundamental reorientations are occurring in the way human beings read their world. The changing mind-set about the way education is being viewed and managed should be seen in this context.

Consider how some strands have now come together. In 1970, just twenty years ago, a group of international experts in Educational Administration gathered at the University of New England at the end of the second International Intervisitation Program (IIP 70) and resolved, in a memorable meeting, to form the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration (CCEA), the body which links national associations like the Australian Council for Educational Administration (ACEA) in a world-wide fellowship. Through two decades the CCEA and the ACEA have enriched the field of Educational Administration. But over the past five years particularly, not only has the field of Educational Administration been coopted into a wider professional grouping but education itself has been coopted by external economic and political forces.

By 1990 Australia had experienced almost ten years of incessant activity to restructure education. As one who has participated in and lived through the reconstruction of Ministries and the education systems in this country for two decades, and who has tried to track those developments in a systematic and relatively detached way, I sense that Educational Administration as a field is at a delicately critical phase. In fact, there is a rumbling in the clouds above us - they are no longer merely on the horizon - which could in fact blow the whole field of Educational Administration apart, both for practitioners and for the scholars associated with the field.

Educational Administration has experienced several of these clear-cut crises in its time. In their book about the "developing decades", the period of the so-called "theory movement in Educational Administration" from 1955 to 1975, Cunningham, Hack and Nystrand (1977) tell how the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) made an

almost sudden break with their past practices and thinking when they invited to the 1955 conference three keynote speakers from outside their discipline - Colladarci, Getzels and Halpin, all of them psychologists. That conference changed the direction of Educational Administration, from one which concentrated on the wisdom derived from practice to one which used systematic research and the scholarly work in cognate fields to open up the grounded theory of school management. A second turning point occurred in 1974/75, with the retirement of the scholar who had led the theory movement, Roald Campbell, and the vigorous debates which followed the 1975 International Intervisitation Program in Great Britain. (IIP 75) at which Thom Greenfield presented in his paper on the phenomenology of school administration a thesis which fundamentally questioned the theory base on which the whole field had been built.

We cannot consider Educational Administration in the 1990s with either complacency or equanimity, for over the past ten years, virtually throughout the 1980s, a fundamental shift has occurred in the way Australian schools and school systems have been managed. Furthermore, we are only now beginning to realise that the same shift in the frame of reference is occurring in parallel ways in others countries around the world - such as in New Zealand, Canada, Japan, United States, Great Britain, and Europe. Three aspects of that shift will be discussed here, namely (1) the changing nature of educational managers (2) changes to the organization they are managing, and (3) the changing way in which the process of education is being conceived of. We will then speculate about some likely consequences.

II
About Educators and Managers

Look at the membership of the two peak councils for educators in this country, the Australian College of Education and the Australian Council for Educational Administration. Do they contain the people recognized as the leaders in the field of education? Do they contain the people occupying the senior posts in education? And where is the acknowledged professional leadership situated at the present time?

Or put it another way. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Australian College of Education and the ACEA would have had in their membership every Director-General and Chief Executive of

Education in this country, most Professors of Education, probably most of the Directors of tertiary colleges, and probably most of the people holding senior educational positions. They would have been the organizations to which every Principal of both private and public schools hoped to belong. Is that still the case? Is the ACEA the body for those involved in Educational Administration which the Business Council of Australia is for the captains of industry? And if not, why not?

One aspect of the answer seems to lie in the fact that educational roles themselves are going through a metamorphosis. When in a private conversation I asked Professor Don Willower who in USA were the eminent scholar-practitioners, especially the Superintendents of Schools acknowledged as the nation's opinion leaders - the kind of people who spoke, wrote and were quoted about the management of education, schools, and school systems - he commented that it had become progressively more difficult to be either a successful scholar in Educational Administration (or in any field for that matter) or a competent administrator. It was now almost impossible to be both.

The Educator Profession:
It becomes obvious, then, that Education is no longer the definable club it once may have been. It has become a more diffuse, more complicated, more connected, in fact a more political arena. Consider the following, for example :

- It is no longer as clear as it once may have been that there is an entity which can be called the teaching *profession*. It is problematical, for example, when the main public mouthpiece for teachers is a trade union affiliated with the ACTU. As Hugh Sockett (1989: 99) has observed in an insightful discussion of professionalism, the literature "provides a bleak account of the possibilities of teaching having the status of a profession".

- Secondly, some of the best teachers in the country, people still actively and daily involved in teaching and who identify with educators, are not associated with schools at all; they work in the armed services, in private industry, in industrial training, in personnel development agencies, and in allied areas like nurse education. They are clearly teachers but not school-teachers. Are they included formally in the "teaching profession"?

- Thirdly, we know that many, very able teachers have been leaving schools to take up quite lucrative and rewarding posts in both the public service and private enterprise. Do we still regard them as part of the education profession? The answer might be that if they continue to identify with this occupational group (whatever it now is), then they are included. But the answer begs the question. If their preservice training and experience as educators equipped them for these new roles, then the educator group does indeed contain some elements of the real estate or travel or hospitality industries, to name three, since it was *teacher* preparation which equipped them for such roles. At what point does a person with degrees in medicine cease to be regarded as a doctor?

- Fourthly, a fairly significant number of the people who now occupy senior educational posts clearly do *not* identify with the educator group. They do not call themselves educators. Some position-holders whom we once regarded as being in the profession no longer want to be so identified.

- And fifthly, even those senior people who are educators by training and experience do not see it either as important or as an advantage formally to join the peak educator councils or professional associations. The educator network clearly no longer provides them with strength for their work; presumably some other network does.

We are confronted, then, by what seems to be a fundamental shift in the frame of reference about education, and we need to explore what the ramifications of that shift are likely to be. So what characterizes the senior educator positions now, and how have they changed?

Economic positivists as chief executives:
During the 1980s, both Commonwealth and State governments adopted the device of creating within the public service a so-called Senior Executive Service (SES), a pool of senior managers (the term is used advisedly) who can be assigned to particular roles, projects or offices and for a specified period, anywhere across the service. The assumption underlying the SES is that expertise for a particular role is less valued than transferable managerial skills, especially those in financial and personnel management and in policy development. In consequence, the postings are much more fluid now than they were five years ago and the people in them are rolled over frequently (to borrow an

appropriate financial term!). It is becoming less the case now that the persons in managerial roles must have a professional background in the service area for which their department is responsible.

Michael Pusey (1987) has underetaken a study of the Commonwealth SES which includes interviews with 230 people who belong to it. As a result, he has been able to define whether they have characteristics in common. They do; markedly so! The typical top public servant, it turns out,

* Is male, and aged in the early 40's. He has experienced rapid promotion, and has the reputation of being a "whizz kid".

* Has an Economics degree. An Economics graduate has twice the likelihood of being promoted as a person with any other kind of degree.

* Is highly educated, usually with a higher degree in Economics or Business Administration. He has come through a "high fee-paying prestigious private or GPS school".

* Came from a financial or market-oriented department, and has been mobile across "policy" jobs, eschewing the "program and services" departments.

* Identifies with the financial community *outside* the Public Service.When asked what is the most influential experience he has had in his working life, he is likely to state a period with GATT (General Agreement on Trades and Tarrifs), or a Trade Mission, or the OECD, or the World Bank.

* Identifies less with other colleagues in the public service, or with the public service itself, than he does with the private sector, with corporate business.

* His career line contains the option of moving across to a higher paid position in the private sector, particularly to a firm with international connections.

Take as an example Dr Vince Fitzgerald who was put in charge when the super-Ministry called the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) was created. Although in his early

40's, he had already been a Permanent Head in another portfolio before he joined Education. In fact, he came from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, thereby bringing to Education an employment training background - not a school-teacher orientation so much as a business-needs approach. He has a Harvard doctorate in the economics field. At the Economic Summit which Prime Minister Hawke and Treasurer Keating called after the election in 1983, it was Dr. Fitzgerald who helped to draft the key government paper containing the celebrated Scenarios 1,2 and 3. He subsequently resigned from the Commonwealth Public Service to join an international financial services company.

Dr Fitzgerald's successor, Mr Greg Taylor, came from the Industries Assistance Commission, is a career public servant who has worked in Treasury, with the International Monetary Fund, as Australian Minister (Financial) as the OECD, and as Deputy Secretary of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet where he also headed the Economics and Social Policy Division. He fits Pusey's category; he is an economist, not an educator.

Chief Education Executives who are not professional educators: Consider the significance of another set of changes which occurred in Australia during 1989. There was a dramatic development in Tasmania following the succession to office of the Field (Labor) Government. Until July 1989, Mr Ken Axton had been the longest serving, incumbent Director-General of Education in Australia. Just before the Gray (Liberal) Government fell, his contract had been renewed for a further term. Soon after the government changed, Axton suddenly took early retirement. The Tasmanian Government renamed his office "Permanent Secretary for Education", and as if to reinforce the impression that a manager rather than an educator was regarded as more appropriate for the role, Mr Bruce Davis, who formerly headed the Department for Lands, Parks and Wildlife and who is not a professional educator, was named to head Education. The new Minister for Education (Mr Peter Patmore) is a lawyer.

Across the Tasman, a government white paper entitled Tomorrow's Schools was issued in 1988 by Mr David Lange in his capacity as Minister for Education, outlining plans effectively to privatize New Zealand education. To implement the changes quickly, he brought in as Director-General of Education from another Department and on a one-year contract Dr Russ Ballard, a forester by profession. The new structure went into operation

on I October1989, and with the planning done, Dr Ballard was re-assigned as chief executive of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. He was succeeded by an educator.

Or consider the case of Victoria. At the October 1988 State election, Ms Joan Kirner became the new Minister for Education. The Chief Executive of the Ministry (Dr Graham Allen) had been appointed under the previous Minister but sickness had forced him to take extended sick leave. On the day Dr Allen returned to his office, Ms Kirner advised him that he should retire. Dr Allen's position was then filled by the transfer of Ms Anne Morrow from the Premier's Department. Although she is a former teacher, the Chief Executive position appeared to have gone to a public service insider rather than to a person publicly visible as an educator.

Whatever messages one wants to read into these kinds of moves, they nevertheless set the precedent for a non-educator to be appointed as the chief schools officer. Tight financial control and tidy management along the best business administration lines seem to be favoured in the appointments rather than educational insight and identification with the teaching profession.

The Impermanent Head:
The rapid succession of people through the office of the chief executive has been one of the notable features of the 1980s. Gone are the times when the Director-General served through the period in office of several Ministers. Indeed, gone is the position of Director-General, the educator who gained promotion through the system and in his last years acted as educational spokeman (there have been no women Directors-General) and as an apolitical administrator. The Chief Executive is now likely to have been appointed for a fixed term, he or she is being seen more and more as a political appointment, and is likely to lose the position if there is a change in either the government or the Minister. Making educational pronouncements as a professional is now a hazardous act; the Chief Executive is regarded as a manager, and it is the Minister who makes the pronouncements, educational as well as political. The office may be known as that of the "permanent Head", but impermanence seems to be a common characterisitic of its holders.

During the 1980s, twenty four people have occupied the eight positions in the States and Territories equivalent with that of Director-General of Education. Only five of them have retired in

the normal way. Eleven, almost half of them, have been re-assigned, or have been retired early, or have moved to another posting.

Political intrusion into the executive role:
The role of the Minister of Education has undergone a profound change since the 1970s. The influence of the Ministers appears to have grown with their qualifications for the job. All of the 1989 Ministers had undertaken a tertiary education. Two of the six State Ministers had a doctorate. Many Ministers are former teachers or are married to a teacher.

Take Victoria as an example. The Minister holding office in 1989, Mrs Joan Kirner, was a foundation member of the Australian Schools Commission during the 1970s, she had earned a national reputation for her involvement with the parents-in-schools movement, and she had played a formative role in the party's Education Policy Committee. Her husband is a secondary school Principal. There could be few politicians with better preparation for or knowledge about her portfolio. Mrs Kirner's two predecessors, Caroline Hogg and Ian Cathie, were both former teachers; Robert Fordham before them is married to a teacher. All four Ministers are tertiary educated.

Because of these factors, there has been a growing tendency since the mid-1970s for the Minister to assume a much more prominent role not only in setting policy but also in managing the system, intruding into some of the functions which it was once taken for granted belonged with the Director-General. As Creed (1989) has shrewdly observed,

> *Will there be an end to restructuring? The clear answer is no. Ministers have an unjustified faith in organizational restructuring as a means of implementing their policies. Such change is highly visible and gives the impression of decisive Ministerial action within the short space of time available between elections. While Ministers continue to exercise the functions of the chief executive, restructuring will continue.*

The symbolism of appointments:
We have been aware for several decades that various publics read consistent messages into the way senior appointments are made. We consider three recent cases here.

Mr Robert Winder, the New South Wales Director-General of Education and one of Australia's eminent educators, retired at

the beginning of1988. The Labor government appointed as his replacement an educator from outside both the system and the State; an action of that kind usually signals some dissatisfaction with the status quo. Dr Gregor Ramsey, a former South Australian, had been until his new appointment a full-time Commissioner of the federal body coordinating and funding tertiary education across the country. Ramsey was seen as a Labor appointee.

In the State election held early in 1988, the long established Labor government was replaced by a conservative coalition headed by Mr Nick Griener, a Harvard Business School graduate committed to economic rationalism and a hard-line approach to government budgeting. Following the swearing in of the new Minister of Education (Dr Terry Metherell), the new Director-General was dis-appointed, after being in the post for only a few weeks. Dr Ramsey's return to Canberra to take over the Chairmanship of the Higher Education Council, itself newly created by the national Minister for Education (Mr John Dawkins), seems to confirm the political influence on the top appointments in both State and national arenas.

The NSW government then set up two inquiries, one aimed at improving the efficiency of the administration of the school system and headed by one of the country's most respected business consultants (Dr Brian Scott), and the second a much wider- ranging select committee headed by a former national Minister of Education (Sir John Carrick). The new government was also signalling dissatisfaction with the existing situation.

Or take the case of New Zealand. On 8 July 1989, Ms Maris O'Rourke was named as the new chief executive of the New Zealand Ministry for Education. The title "Director-General of Education" was abolished. If ever an appointment was intended to send symbolical messages, this one was.

- Ms O'Rourke is the first women in the role.

- She is a pre-school expert, having lectured in this field at the Kindergarten Teachers College, and more recently being the co-ordinator of the "Before Five" project team.

- She was identified with the new structures because of her membership on the Meade Committee which ran an inquiry into preschool education parallel with the Picot Committee's work on primary and secondary education.

- Before becoming an educator, she had gone overseas to study engineering, farming and hotel management, all key areas in the New Zealand economy and therefore targets for industrial training initiatives.

- And she is an expert in bilingualism, particularly Maori.

Her appointment was not from within the traditional ranks. She is considered an academic and policy analyst rather than a mainstream schoolteacher. She also represents new priorities at the forefront of New Zealand education.

Or consider the case of South Australia. Early in 1988, the Director-General of Technical and Further Education retired. Then on the day before Easter, the Education Department lost through early retirement its three most senior men - Mr John Steinle (the Director-General), Mr Jim Giles (the Deputy Director-General), and Mr Colin Laubsch (its most senior Regional Director). The South Australian Government appointed Mr Peter Kirby (from Victoria) to head TAFE, Dr Ken Boston (from the Victorian Ministry) to be chief executive of the SA Education Ministry, and Mr Garth Boomer (from the Schools Commission in Canberra) to be his associate. All were outside appointments, two of them from Victoria. The pattern of these appointments seems to semaphore that the government did not have confidence in South Australian educators, and that Victorian patterns were to be translated into SA.

When events of this kind occur repeatedly, they create an impression of instability, dissatisfaction with existing practices, and a sense of foreboding in those already in the service.

In summary, then, we will have to reschedule our thinking about the senior positions within the education service. The changes I have described have not as yet affected the private schools as fundamentally as they have the public school systems in this country, but they are sufficient to underline the fact that there are new economic, political, managerial and symbolical factors influencing who is appointed to run the educational enterprises of Australia. Those positions are not necessarily available to the educators who have climbed their way up through the teaching service.

III
The Nature of School Organizations

Not only has the leadership pattern changed, but the organizations responsible for delivering the educational service have also been changed fundamentally. There have been nearly fifty documents or government reports dealing with the restructuring of Education Ministries in Australia over the past decade. Some are large volumes, like the Beazley Report (WA) and the Keeves Reports (SA); some are quite slender like South Australia's draft 3-year plan (1989) and Western Australia's Better Schools (1987) document. Australia has been averaging about five such reports a year; there were at least nine in the twelve months of 1988/89.

The first reports tended to be long and painstaking documents based on public hearings and evidence. By the end of the 1980s, these documents had become more slender and more frequent as the pace of change overtook the last reconstruction and replaced it with a newer version. The 1989 Scott Report on the shape of the New South Wales Education Department, for example, is just 40 pages in length, yet it proposes profound changes to the administration of Australia's largest school system.

From these major policy documents which every State and Territory produced during the1980s, it is clear that some fundamental rethinking about the nature of educational administration is now going on. Not surprisingly, there are also some common themes, but it is not certain that anyone has yet got the design features right. Let us list some of those common features in order to discern what kind of an organization is now emerging.

Simple, political control:
A new, insistent, and apparently universal priority is efficient management, an emphasis on cost management, cost effectiveness, efficient allocation and use of resources, and a deliberate observation of governmental priorities. Economic considerations are almost overpowering.

The structures also re-establish clear and simple lines of control. Some powers have been re-centralized and the line of ministerial responsibility has been re-affirmed. More recently there has been a tendency, even by Labor Governments, to wipe

out statutory authorities, and to replace them with bodies directly responsible to the Minister, through a Departmental Chief Executive. Ministers from both the left and the right of politics are now less inclined to have autonomous agencies within their portfolios.

Portfolio coordination, policy coordination:
The structures also emphasize portfolio co-ordination, the consolidation of the processes for policy making and policy advice. Clearly, Ministers prefer uncomplicated decision-making.

Lean Head-Office management:
The structures have broken up or disbanded the large central bureaucracies, and have replaced them with lean, head-office management. As an example, a recent Victorian restructure dispersed literally hundreds of officers from central advisory units (like those for Special Education, Computor Education, Curriculum Services, and policy advice) into regional posts. That State has now created School Support Centres (SSC) which are expected to be entrepreneurial teacher (or education) centres, providing services on request from client schools or school clusters. Similar proposals to disaggregate the Head Office are contained in the NSW Scott Report and in the New Zealand reconstruction.

Devolution of responsibility:
Every State and Territory system has experimented with some form of regionalization although no substantial agreement exists about the optimum size of regions or how they should function. "Devolution of responsibility" is a frequently used term in the reconstructions. The matter of school-based governance was addressed in the Keeves Reports (1981, 1982) in South Australia, the Hughes Report (1982) in Tasmania, and the Beazley Report (1984) in Western Australia, for example.

A strong common theme in all the restructuring is that schools must be given greater responsibilty to order their own affairs. Terms like the "self-managing school" and the "self-determining school" are used, and the role of the Principal as an effective manager has been emphasized.

The documents talk about "Better Schools' or "Excellent Schools" or just "Excellence". The terms imply that the school's management must be responsive to the clients' wishes. A kind of free market is encouraged, and the systems would do away with enrolment zoning, if they dared.

Schools are expected to practise adequate resource management. A "resource agreement" of some kind is now usually implied by which the school is required to demonstrate that it has been a good steward of the resources given to it. Some performance or productivity indicators are generally imposed.

National priorities:
Regardless of what the country's constitution might say, the national government has become one of the key players in deciding educational policies and practices. In the 1970s and 1980s, national governments across the world felt impelled to impose their own priorities on education, sometimes for defence purposes, but more often because the justification was economic. If the country is to compete within the new international economic order which rewards market competitiveness, where employment openings occur in the services sector rather than in factory production and manufacturing, and in which a highly educated workforce is a necessary condition for success, then those educational provisions which affect the country's economy become a legitimate concern of national government .

IV
The post-bureaucratic organization

These changes all point to the fact that the new kind of educational organizational structure is intended to be both post-bureaucratic and post-industrial. As has happened so often in the past, education is being forced to adopt the modes of organization which appear to be successful in the business or private sector. Bureaucracy grew out of an economy which was predominantly industrial, but the post-industrial economy is now spawning new forms of organization. Put bluntly, a business which operates on bureaucratic lines cannot compete in a (post-industrial) economy which guarantees survival only to those firms which are flexible, which can make quick, strategic decisions, which encourage innovation and entrepreneurship, which value creativity rather than conformity, which give their members the power to take local decisions and to exercise initiative, and which regard the people in the organization more as partners than as property.

These qualities can be found even in those post-industrial organizations which appear to be huge, international, and multi-faceted. They have discovered that there are better models of organization available than bureaucracy. The centre does not

necessarily know best. While there are some frameworks, probably centrally devised, which all will honour, and while there is a set of priorities which all members of the firm must observe, it would be presumptuous, if not arrogant, of those at headquarters to think they should or even could impose controls on all the day-to-day operations of the firm, or monitor all the activities of its several parts, or make all the strategic decisions for all the company's members. Education systems and individual schools are now being forced to adopt the fluid, entrepreneurial, organizational patterns which characterize the new growth areas of the economy. If that is the case, then educators need to be clear what the post-industrial organization looks like.

New assumptions underlying organization:
Charles Handy (1985 : 389-412) has pointed out that some of the assumptions which we took for granted in the bureaucratic organization are now no longer believed. They include the following:

* Specialization is no longer seen as a strength. There is increasing emphasis on generalist (rather than specialist) skills; the new organization requires adaptable people who can turn their hands to several tasks and who view the organizational and professional world more globally than the narrow specialist.

* Hierarchy and status can be disabilities, particularly when teamwork and shared skills are needed. Collegiality, not hierarchy, now are favoured, and so is co-ownership. Every worker has a stake either literally or metaphorically in the company. The company does not "belong" only to those who put up the money in the first place.

* Staff are not property. The company does not own them. The company must not presume to be able to buy and sell them. Every person who joins the company 'owns" part of it, and invests some of himself or herself in it. In short, the staff are stake-holders rather than "employees".

* Whereas a wage used to signify that a person is paid for the time he or she gives to the company, the new mode is that you are paid for doing a job, for rendering a service.

So a "fee for service" replaces being paid just for turning up at 9 o'clock. Contracts are replacing salaries.

* Equipment and machinery are not simply capital, things owned by the company. Rather, they are the means whereby the capacity of the people who work in the firm is extended; in short, they are tools. This distinction has been heightened by the advent of information technology which has enabled firms to shed many of the positions once occupied by middle management.

The constellation or network organization:
The kind of organization which emerges has been variously described as a constellation, as a federation, as atomized, as dispersed, as a "membership organization", as a network organization or as the "shamrock organization"(Handy, 1978: ch. 9; 1989, chs. 4-6). It is described well by Toffler in his book The Adaptive Corporation (1985), which analyses how the giant American firm AT and T should restructure to ensure productivity. There develops in Toffler's adaptive cooporation a centre or core which retains "tight control over technical quality, research and development, major investment decisions, planning, training, and coordinative activities" and which becomes "the intelligence centre of a large constellation of companies and organizations".

Toffler proposes a much more extensive shedding of functions to subsidiaries. He argues that functions that are repetitive (like cleaning), capital intensive (i.e. which require the purchase of expensive machinery or equipment), controversial (like media relations, counselling or social welfare) or which can "piggy-back on someone else's capability" (like the production of some curriculum materials, evaluation, assessment, or research and development projects) could well be discharged by "spinning off subsidiaries and contracting out". (ibid:139)

By this means he developed an organizational structure which he called a constellation. At head office there is a relatively small, lean, headquarters staff, a core which retains tight control over technical quality, research and development, major investment decisions, planning, training, and coordinating activities and which becomes "the intelligence centre of a large constellation of companies and organizations". Indeed, the corporation need employ only a core staff, smaller in number, more highly qualified, and more synoptic in its roles than the

management staff used to be, a group "whose essential product is leadership". (ibid: 128)

The rest of the firm's activities can be conceived of as separable, free-standing functions, the specialized operations which were once handled in branches and divisions. But these functions can be modularized, and then contracted or franchised out to satellite units or subsidiary firms who supply services or components to the mother company, and usually for a negotiated fee. As Toffler points out, it is not necessary for the modular operations to be performed by the firm, nor is it necessary for the firm to own all the subsidiaries which handle the modules. Some of them can be mini-firms, some operating as "firms within the firm", and others as independent entities. Provided the service is carried out to the satisfaction of the parent company, the head office does not need to concern itself with the internal workings of the subsidiary nor to dabble in its work methods, or even to own it. Indeed, some of the company's best executives may form "spin-off companies" with venture capital from the parent company and a contract to provide a guaranteed service for a price.

In summary, then, it is possible to list the characterisitics of the "network organization", the post-industrial organizational format which is beginning to replace conventional bureaucracy.

The network organization:-

- Consists of relatively small units within a bigger "corporation".
- The units are loosely coupled. What goes on inside each unit does not necessarily affect the whole corporation.
- The corporation is co-ordinated in a more or less organic way.
- The flow of information within the firm and among its parts is not dominated by hierarchy.
- Organizational "structuring" means designing the linkages among the activities performed by the units.
- The units do not need to be ordered in a hierarchical way. They are in fact collegially ordered. They also relate to the

core staff in a collegial way. The firm is much more egalitarian than the bureaucracy could ever be.

- The units are mutually dependent.

- Unit managers therefore tend to carry the full range of managerial tasks which once belonged only to the head office.

- It falls to the unit manager to mediate the demands emerging from his or her staff, from peers in the other units, from the parent company, and from the unit's clients. The unit manager has therefore been described as "the man in the middle", an information broker, a negotiator and facilitator.

- The units operate on a provision-of-service basis rather than on a central- control basis. "A climate of commands is replaced by a climate of prohibitions".

- All senior managers have a responsibility to promote or to preserve the culture of the firm.

- The units are expected to be pro-active, anticipating rather than reacting to events.

- The corporation is an "ecology", an environment for inter-related activities.

- Networks and grapevines (that is, informal channels) are legitimate and must be managed by a unit leader. The "paper warfare" should be much less intense than in a bureaucracy, where files and paper records are essential to preserve the corporate memory.

- The internal dynamics of each unit are created by the unit itself. Providing it delivers efficiently, who but the unit cares?

- The unit manager must operate collegially in the whole corporation, and must not adopt a "top-down" or "boss" mentality.

Out of this kind of organization comes a new kind of administrator:

> *The new manager... will not be a classical, hierarchically oriented bureaucrat but a customized version of Indiana Jones: proactive, entrepreneurial, communicating in various languages, able to inspire, motivate and persuade subordinates, superiors, colleagues and outside constituents.* (Gerding and Serenhuijseur, 1987:127).

These basic premises, it seems to me, are now developing in the educational organizations being used to replace both schools and the Head Offices which we knew in the past.

V
The new metaphor to describe education:

I have argued that the managers of educational enterprises are now different from what we knew in the 1960s and early 1970s. We have also seen in the 1980s a wholesale rebuilding of the structures of the organizations responsible for schooling. The third massive change - not one necessarily for the better - is the way the educational process is being conceived of.

The overwhelming impression left by the most recent round of reconstructions is that there has been a profound reconceptualization of the organization of Australian education, in schools no less than systemically. Bluntly, there has been a paradigm shift. It could best be epitomized as a shift from "educational administration" to "efficient management". This conceptual change seems to have crystallized since 1985. The ideas of efficiency (in management), effectiveness (in measuring outcomes), accountability (in financial responsibility) and productivity (in meeting the market's requirements) were inherent in most of the reports written in the 1980s, but they were never so explicit as now. "Management" is the pervasive term being used.

Perhaps the most symbolically significant conveyor of the change is the way in which titles using the descriptor "education" are falling out of currency and being replaced with titles including the terms "manager" and "executive". To be precise, the "Chief Education Officer" in the ACT has become the "Chief Executive Officer". Several of the Education Ministries are

now headed by a person officially called "Chief Executive". The operational position once labelled "Director-General of Education" is now called "Chief General Manager, Office of School Administration" in Victoria, "Permanent Secretary for Education" in Tasmania, "Secretary" in the Northern Territory. The predominant descriptors have changed.

So also the structures into which these positions are placed are being modelled upon the modern corporation, the flexible conglomerate which keeps central control of the essential and strategic areas but allows entrepreneurial freedom to the operating units which make up the body corporate. It is of course significant that so much of the re-structuring of the 1980s uses the terms of "corporate management". School systems are borrowing from business the organizational structures which appear to give simultaneously the flexibility to operate in volatile market conditions and also the means to stay in control of events.

The point was expressed succinctly by the Victorian Ministry's Chief Executive Dr Graham Allen (in Sarros and Beare,1988: 12):

> *Corporate management is thus a new culture, not just a new process; a new way of thinking, as much as a new way of doing things; an intervention aimed at organizational improvement as the key to improvement in the quality of education.* (underlining mine)

The new extended metaphor which is used both to justify and to describe the restructuring is also being used to represent education as a business operating in a market economy. Education institutions are represented as serving consumers or clients and competing for their custom. School boards or councils are the means whereby schools can guage the requirements of the client community. It is assumed that there will be competition for resources, that schools which can provide a marketable product will be the ones worthy to survive, that the school and its teachers will monitor their performance outcomes, that they will be entrepreneurial and find their niche in the market for their services. Nationally, education is described as an exportable commodity, and the revenue it earns in export dollars is often quoted. In November 1988, for example, the national Minister referred to the "burgeoning education growth industry", announced that "Australia's export education earnings" would exceed A$ 500 million in 1989, and that "our

education sector can play a very important part in our overall trade performance".

The new metaphor is pervasive. It has become part of the vernacular of education, it provides a pattern for policy development, and it has become reified in the new structures being built for the management both of schools and of the systems to which they are attached. The market metaphor is being used by politicians, business people, and the public not only to explain the new patterns for education funding and resource management, but it has also become the favoured way of explaining the education process itself.

VI
Speculating about the next decade

We do not have the space here to explore all the consequences for educators in these fundamental shifts to the leadership patterns, to the structure of educational organizations, or to the metaphors used to explain the education process itself. In this final section, let us speculate briefly about some possible outcomes, and give some illustrations of how the educational profession may be forced to change its practices.

Self-governing schools:
Only the opposition of teacher unions seems to have prevented a large-scale privatizing of schools, especially public schools. And there are social equity grounds for arguing against wholesale privatization. New Zealand, which already had a tradition for local governance through its District Boards, has clearly gone the furthest in its most recent reconstruction in allowing schools to conduct their own affairs, under a negotiated charter and a Board of Trustees for each school. The trend around the world is towards deregulation of schools, freeing them to act as self-contained entities within a network of schools.

Professional services:
Those services which schools need but which are beyond the capacity of any one school to provide are now increasingly being dispensed out of Education Support Centres, which provide the service but for a fee, even if it a book entry only. Those centres, it is being said, should be required to survive on the quality of the service they give. The Centres ought to operate like free-standing firms, not as units controlled within an hierarchical framework. In fact they ought not to be linked into a large organization chart or made part of the hierarchical order;

instead, they should be shown as outrider organizations, operating on their own and linked to the organizational core only by the provisions for financing and auditing.

The educational administrator:
The management roles in education are becoming both differentiated and quite diverse. The role of the Head of School differs from that of the Education Service Centre coordinator and also from that of the Head Office Manager. It will need to be widely acknowledged among teachers that the old career line of Senior Teacher to Principal to Inspector to Head Office has gone, probably for ever. Indeed, the training for a policy role in a State or national body may need to be quite different from the courses which prepare people to become the Head of a school. One obvious consequence of the 1980s developments is that the traditional lines of teacher promotion have been destroyed.

Teacher career patterns:
Teacher award restructuring is also a significant development, since it implies that some people should be able to enjoy a satisfying professional life and appropriate promotion without leaving the teaching role. But in order to achieve this end, it may be necessary to make virtue of necessity and use some devices which teacher bodies have firmly resisted until now.

The Federal Police, for example, were considering a proposal in 1989 to put all its officers on contracts. "Individual contract employment" allows the service to keep its permanent staff small; it allows each officer to negotiate competitively for the work he or she feels able to do without the need to accept duties which the officer does not want to accept. It removes the artificial seniority system. It also means that the work of a policeman can be dis-aggregated and put together in different packages of functions which make use of the different expertise in those bidding for a contract. Some studies have apparently shown that "up to 85 per cent of (a policeman's) working time is spent on other than crime control" (Bruer, 1989:13)

It would be possible for teachers to function as providers of services rather than as employees, to supply schools with expertise of various kinds without having to be subject to the complicated fabric of governmental or systemic career structures. School management could then become the activity of a core staff which recruits instructional services from professional companies of teachers. Teachers, especially those in hard-to-provide categories, could have their firm negotiate a

contract for them, including a fee for service at rates the market will pay, and they could opt for however many hours they wished to work. It seems likely, indeed, that we will find an adequate number of science, mathematics and commerce teachers, for example, only by paying them a rate which will attract them out of other industries.

The working year, the working life

In fact, the most profound change may come in the way professional people can plan their own careers. The signs are already there in the high rates of stress being felt in such occupational areas as teaching and social welfare.

In a provocative discussion of the working patterns likely to emerge in the 1990s, Charles Handy (1989: ch. 2) argues that the terms "retirement" and "full-time work" are rapidly losing their meaning. Handy points out that of the 1.7 million new jobs expected in Britain by 1995, one million will be professional; 400,000 manual jobs would have disappeared by that year; McKinsey's, he said, had predicted that by the year 2000, seventy per cent of all the jobs in Europe would require cerebral rather than manual skills.

We have pointed out that firms will tend to employ only their core staff as permanents, and that they will favour the buying in of the services which they require. The core staff will be professional, highly cerebral and highly trained. But theirs will be an intensive and shortened life at the top. "Most of them", Handy (1989: 37) points out, " will be in their thirties and forties, putting in their... hours in huge annual chunks". "It will be a shorter life but a more furious one, " says Handy (ibid: 36). They will have a period when they are driven, and then will follow a period when they will drive themselves, largely as self-employed people contracting out their expertise for a fee. So, comments Handy (ibid),

> *The next generation of full-time core workers...,be they professionals, managers, technicians or skilled workers, can expect to start their full-time careers later - and to leave them earlier. This is the crucial point. The core worker will have a harder but shorter job, with more people leaving full-time employment in their late forties or early fifties, partly because they no longer want the pressure that such jobs will increasingly entail, but mainly because there will be younger more qualified and more energetic people available for these core jobs.*

Work will not stop for these people, but it will be a different kind of job. When they take on work to satisfy themselves, it "will not be a *job* as they have known it". When these people step out of their intensive period of employment, they will be ready for a series of intellectually demanding assigments, but they will take them on in their own time and on their own terms. It is likely that, if the education profession were suitably configured to use them, it could gain the services of a large number of experienced, highly educated, and wise operators. Teaching could become their last job, rather than their first. Handy warns (ibid: 39),

> *Organizations may have to learn to be more flexible in the way they run things, more willing to recognize that they are buying the talents of someone but not necessarily all their time.*

And that will apply to schools no less than to any other organization.

VII
Conclusion

I began by suggesting that Educational Administration as a field of study and practice has been under heavy pressure through the 1980s, and that many of the changes are being mandated by forces outside of education. In many respects, educators are not in control of the events. The transformations have occurred in the senior positions within the education enterprise, in the shape of educational organizations (including schools), and in the way education is being conceived of and described. The ramifications of these changes will be profound, I have suggested. They will change our research agendas, our career lines, our training programs, even the shape of our working lives. They could transform the way teachers are appointed and the way schools are run. They could influence who becomes a teacher and at what point in their lives.

It is not merely that the changes are being driven by forces outside of education. We are in one of those transitional phases in Western or developed countries where we are moving out of economies driven by manufacturing industries and into the post-industrial phase. Since so much of the new economic success depends upon education, upon the level of education in the community, upon people's adaptability and their capacity for continual re-education, it is certain that the transformations will be long-term, and that they will continue without respite. We

are after all at a turning point in the history of the advanced economies of the world, and it is therefore a time for some really inspired thinking, especially by those charged with the administration of educational organizations.

Bibliography and References

Allen, G. "Corporate management in Education: the Victorian case." In Sarros and Beare, 1988

Beare, H. "The structural reform movement in Australian education and its effect on schools". Journal of Educational Administration. 41(2). Summer 1983

Beare, H. "Changing Structures in Education". In Simpkins, W.S., A.R. Thomas and E.B. Thomas (eds). Principal and Change: The Australian Experience. Armidale, NSW : University of New England Teaching Monographs. 1987

Beare, H. "Images of the Future for Primary School Principals" The New Zealand Primary School Principal. Vol 4 No 1 Feb. 1989

(Beazley Report) Education in Western Australia. Report of the Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Minister for Education in W,A, (Chair: K.E. Beazley). Perth,: W.A. Govt. Printer. 1984

Bell, D. "The Coming of the Post-industrial State". Educational Forum. XL (4) May 1976

Boston, K. Three Year Draft Plan. Adelaide: Education Department of South Australia. 1989

Bruer, M. "A contract on the police" The Age (Melbourne) 16/8/89 p.13

Caldwell, B.J., and J.M. Spinks. The Self-Managing School. London: Falmer Press. 1988

Callahan, R. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1962

Creed, P. "Seeking firm Ministry structure". The Herald (Melbourne). 28 February, 1989

Cunningham, L., W.G. Hack and R.O. Nystrand (eds). Educational Administration: the Developing Decades. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan. 1977

Dawkins, J. Strengthening Australia's Schools: a consideration of the focus and content of schooling. Canberra: AGPS. 1988

Dawkins, J. "Australian education soon to be a half-a-billion dollar a year export earner" Press Release 223/88. 28 November 1988

Deal, T.E. and A.A. Kennedy. Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley. 1982

Edwards, R.C.M. Structural Reform in Australian Education 1967-87: An Analysis of Key Documents. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne. 1989

Gerding, G., and R.F. Sevenhuijsen. "Public Managers in the Middle". In Kooiman and Eliassen, 1987.

Gogel, D.J. "Corporate Re-Structuring - Management Fights the Raiders". Management Review. April 1988

Goodrich, J.N. "Privatization in America". Management Review. Aug. 1988

Handy, C. Gods of Management. London: Pan Books. 1979

Handy, C. Understanding Organizations. 3rd edition. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin. 1985

Handy, C. and R. Aitken. Understanding Schools as Organizations. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin. 1986

Handy, C. The Age of Unreason. London: Century Hutchinson. 1989

Harman, W. Global Mind Change. Indianapolis: Knowledge Systems. 1988

Hayes, R. and R.Watts. Corporate Revolution: New Strategies for Executive Leadership. London: Heinemann. 1986

(Hughes Report) Review of Efficiency and Effecxtiveness of the Education Department. (Chair: P.W. Hughes). Hobart: Government of Tasmania. 1982

Jones, B. Sleepers Wake! Technology and the Future of Work. Melbourne: Oxford University Press. 1982

(Keeves Report) Education and Change in South Australia. First Report, Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia (Chair: J.P. Keeves). Adelaide: S.A. Govt. Printer. February 1982,

(Keeves Report) Education and Change in South Australia. Second Report, Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia (Chair: J. P. Keeves). Adelaide: S.A. Govt. Printer. January 1982.

Kooiman, J. and K.A. Eliassen (eds). Managing Public Organizations: Lessons from Contemporary European Experience. London: Sage. 1987

Lange, Rt Hon D. Tomorrow's Schools: The Reform of Educational Administration in New Zealand. Wellington, NZ : NZ Govt Printer. 1988

Naisbitt, J. and P. Aburdene. Re-Inventing the Corporation: Transforming Your Job and Your Company for the New Information Society. London: Macdonald & Co. 1985

Peters, T.S. and R.H. Waterman. In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper & Row. 1982

Peters, T. Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for the Management Revolution. London: Macmillan. 1987

(Picot Report) Administering for Excellence. Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration (Chair: B. Picot). Wellington, NZ: NZ Ministry of Education. 1988

Pusey, M. "Canberra's top public servants under Hawke". The Australian Quarterly. Autumn 1988

Pusey, M. "Canberra's public service is going dry". Australian Society. July 1988

Robinson, S. "The Day of the Jackall: Assassination is Looming for Moribund Management". Rydges. Dec. 1984

Sarros, J. and H. Beare (eds). Australian Contributions to Educational Management: Some Commentaries by Chief Education Executives. Perth, W.A.: Australian Council for Educational Administration. 1988

(Scott Report) Management Review, NSW Education Portfolio (Convenor: Scott, B.). School Renewal: A Strategy to Revitalize Schools Within the New South Wales Education System. Sydney: June 1989

Sockett, H. "Research, practice, and professional aspiration within teaching." Journal of Curriculum Studies. 21(2) 1989

Taylor, T. "Education model at the helm". New Zealand Herald (Auckland). 8/7/89 p.3

Toffler, A. The Adaptive Corporation. London: Pan Books. 1985

Tomasco, R.M. Downsizing: Reshaping the Corporation of the Future. Boston: Arthur D. Little. 1987

NOTES:

Printed by ELLIKON Printers, 324-328 Napier Street, Fitzroy, Vic. 3065. Telephone: 417 3121